

CACC MEETING MINUTES

COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Thursday, July 22, 2010
10:00 AM - 12:30 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
1501 E. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

AUDIO PHONE NUMBER: (602) 452-3193
AUDIO ACCESS CODE: 1126

MEMBERS PRESENT

Cathy Clarich
Julie Dybas (*Daniel Edwards, proxy*)
Donald Jacobson
Mary Hawkins*
Phillip Knox (*Peter Kiefer*, proxy*)
Patrick McGrath
Rich McHattie (*Becky Magana*, proxy*)
Rona Newton
Patricia Noland*
Michael Pollard, *Chair*
Rick Rager (*Christy Slover, proxy*)
Lisa Royal

GUESTS

Steve Ballance*, *Pima Superior Court*
David Stevens, *Maricopa Superior Court*
Ken Troxel, *Maricopa Superior Court*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Kip Anderson
Timothy Dickerson
Joan Harphant
Doug Pilcher
Paul Thomas

AOC STAFF

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD*
Adele May, *ITD*
Alicia Moffatt, *ITD*
Jim Price, *ITD*
Renny Rapier, *ITD*

* indicates appeared by telephone

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Judge Michael Pollard, Chair, called the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. He very briefly recapped the major decisions made at the summit in place of the June 17 meeting, including doing away with project dashboards and red/yellow/green voting.

MARICOPA CLERK'S FINANCIAL SYSTEM UPDATE

David Stevens, project manager for the RFR replacement portion of the iFIS project, provided his update at the beginning of the meeting due to a schedule conflict. He elaborated on the issue raised in May related to the pullback of subject matter experts needed by his project. The situation continues and affects increasing numbers of individual sprint items on the project plan. He was not comfortable with stating a specific action plan prior to his meeting with the Clerk's Office to examine options and estimate the ultimate impact to the project schedule. Overall, work still remains on schedule, but he considers the project to be in yellow status.

After confirming that a quorum existed, the chair asked for a motion regarding the minutes of the May CACC meeting

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the May 27, 2010, meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT FROM THE SUMMIT ON IMPROVING COORDINATION AMONG PROJECTS AFFECTING THE TRIAL COURTS

Judge Pollard remembered that another decision made at the summit was to share membership between the Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC) and CACC. As a result, Rona Newton, chair of PACC, has been appointed to CACC and Kip Anderson is being appointed to PACC. He then turned the floor over to Karl Heckart who has been developing a tool to use for exposing and monitoring the relationships between automation projects.

TOOL TO INDICATE RELATIONSHIPS AND DEPENDENCIES

Karl briefly recapped the history of CACC leading up to the use of project status dashboards, but reminded members that focusing on the individual trees took CACC's eye off of the forest. He stated that the issue with the perennial sliding schedules of IT projects involves the impact of a slide rather than presence of the slide itself. He agreed with changing the general feel of project reporting from punitive to more collaborative. Karl then toured members through a Mind Map tool he created to create a relationship diagram, starting with priority statewide projects and the local projects they depend on in some form.

While examining the diagram, discussion turned to strategies for inventorying and reporting on all projects. The general flow Karl described included

1. Inventory all strategic projects and their relationships with other projects, statewide and local.
2. Have all project managers update their project information monthly for Stewart to enter into the relationship diagram.
3. When the monthly update reveals a change in scope or date, broker a conversation between the project manager and the managers of any projects dependent on the business

deliver point that has changed. Ideally, the PM would start the process in advance of the CACC meeting, but when they don't staff will inform the related projects.

4. Escalate priority conflicts to COT for resolution if they cannot be worked out at CACC.

AOC will update its projects, dates, and relationships for the August 19 CACC meeting to use as a dry run prior to COT's September 24 meeting.

Members asked about how to capture relationships for new projects and wondered whether the JPIJ could expose project relationships. They recommended that the JPIJ be updated and that CACC review new ones ahead of COT to be able to inform COT of the relationships represented by the potential project. Karl showed a software product that converts the relationship diagram into more of a neural network, rearranging itself around whatever project has the current focus. Members felt the level of information was appropriate for COT review, while the completed relationship diagram with its proliferation of arrows would be far too busy to be meaningful.

Karl recommended that the largest projects continue to provide brief verbal updates each month, regardless of whether milestone dates or scope had changed. Members then asked for clarity on CACC's relationship with the steering committees of those large projects. Karl stated that he sees CACC acting as the "tie-breaker" for any conflicting priorities set by the various steering committees, providing the ultimate direction to the AOC software release manager.

Judge Pollard raised the importance of communication with courts regarding CACC's modified direction and the changing requirements for project managers. He will draft something for Stewart to distribute to members for comment in advance of a wider distribution.

PACC UPDATE

Rona Newton, PACC chair, described PACC's recent request for direction from Committee on Probation (COP) and their desire for PACC to function as a conduit for bringing probation automation needs to COT and AOC for solutions. As a consequence, more business people will be appointed to PACC in place of the current automation resources. Rona will provide this information to COT on September 24 for their approval, then return to COP to request the new members.

STATEWIDE E-FILING UPDATE

Jim Price, e-Filing Project Manager at the AOC, provided the numbers for e-filing subsequent documents in civil cases to the Maricopa Clerk's Office along with the issues exposed thus far. Testing continues on the full e-filing model for general jurisdiction courts' civil cases and on forms development for justice courts. Appellate e-filing implementation is still slated for September. Jim elaborated on a couple of technical frustrations and project dependencies.

Karl explained the kickback coming from lawyers in Maricopa about the AZTurboCourt filing fee in relation to the free filing interface to the Clerks' Office that still exists. Members felt this issue merits consideration by the eCourt subcommittee.

GENERAL JURISDICTION COURTS POST-IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

While awaiting Renny's arrival, Adele May briefed members on the AJACS baseline application training being held this week to equip LJ court representatives to start their gap analysis activities. Karl clarified the "one-rollout" versus "two-rollout" strategy being considered and how it relates to the gap effort for AZTEC replacement versus large volume court needs. He also stated his desire to receive an "initial cut" of what gap exists in the AZTEC replacement product, so development can get underway immediately.

Renny Rapier, AOC's General Jurisdiction (GJ) CMS Project Manager, updated members on the situation with AJACS Release 3.4.1, following initial installation in Yuma and La Paz. Though it had been tested extensively by representatives from 11 courts, an issue arose that the remaining courts felt warranted fixing before further rollout. The current plan is to implement those remaining courts over two weekends in August. Renny pointed out how the lessons learned from the 3.2 rollout were followed with the 3.4.1 release.

Renny also described the recent intensive work of a calendar/scheduling focus group tasked with arriving at set of statewide requirements for a standard calendar report in AJACS. The output of the focus group will be reviewed by other groups prior to AmCad's coding the system changes necessary to generate the standard output. Renny explained why each court is no longer at liberty to create its own calendar summary report, as had been done in AZTEC.

POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS / STAFF UPDATE

Staff member Stewart Bruner explained the reasoning behind the new standing agenda item that resulted from discussion at the June 17 Summit. The thinking was that any project manager within 30 or so days of an implementation would share the challenges and lessons learned for the benefit of other project managers. He replaced the staff update with this item.

The next CACC meeting will take place in Conference Room 106 of the State Courts Building on **August 19, 2010, at 10:00 a.m.**

After the chair confirmed that no other business existed, the meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.